## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

		2008 MAY -6 PM 2: 52	
ТΟ.	_	CLERK US DISTRICT COURT	
	TO: U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
FROM: R. Mullin, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE 5/2/2008			
		408 WQH DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff	
CASE TITLE: Daughtery v. Wilson, et al			
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: <u>Ex Parte Motion for Reconsideration of Appointment of Counsel</u>			
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:			
√ I	Local Rule	Discrepancy	
	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation	
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper	
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.	
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely	
X	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document	
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions	
	7.1	Missing table of contents	
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself	
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order	
		Supplemental documents require court order	
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest	
		OTHER:	
<b>Date forwarded:</b> <u>5/2/2008</u>			
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:			
<del></del>			
<b>≯</b> ₽⁄ ─	The document	is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.	
		is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a ler on all parties.	
	Rejected docum	nent to be returned to pro se or inmate?  Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers	
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1		
	to boom ituio o	CHAMBERS OF: Major	
	Dated: 5/4/	CHAMBERS OF: Major  By: law club	